

REMARKSRestriction/Election

The Examiner restricted this application and required an election of Group I (Claims 1-18) or Group II (Claims 19-23) for prosecution. Applicant provisionally elected Group I (Claims 1-18) for prosecution, and affirmatively confirms this election. Claims 19-23 have been withdrawn from further consideration.

Rejections/Amendments

The Office rejects claims 1-18 and withdraws claims 19-23 from prosecution. Applicant amends claim 1. Claims 1-23 (2 independent claims; 23 total claims) remain pending in the application.

Support for the various amendments may be found in the originally filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. For example, support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found on page 3 (lines 25-33) of the subject application (or paragraph [0013] of the published application).

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102 REJECTIONSKaneko Reference

The Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kaneko (U.S. Patent No. 4,758,910, issued July 19, 1988, assignee is Pioneer Electronic Corporation). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Kaneko discloses a method of display control of a tape deck for selectively displaying tape transport data and one of the audio data items. The tape transport data is for indicating an operating status of a drive system of the tape deck and the audio data items relate to audio signals read out from a magnetic tape.¹

But Kaneko fails to teach, advise, or suggest "a correction section for correcting the acoustic signal using the at least one filter coefficient selected by the filter coefficient selection section so that the acoustic signal matches the image signal being reproduced together" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

¹ Kaneko, column 2, lines 5-16.

First, the tape transport data in Kaneko is not an "image signal being reproduced" (nor is it an acoustic signal). Rather, the tape transport data is for indicating the operating status of the drive system of the tape deck.

Second, Kaneko displays tape transport data or an audio data item (changing back between the two due to a change in operating mode of the tape deck). In other words, a tape playback audio data item is displayed, then a change in the operating mode interrupts the audio data item being displayed and causes the tape transport data to be displayed.² Kaneko does not have a correction section for correcting an acoustic signal so that the audio data item (the alleged acoustic signal) matches the tape transport data (the alleged image signal) being reproduced together. In Kaneko, there is no correction of the audio data item to have it match the tape transport data (being reproduced together).

Third, an exemplary advantage of this feature of the claimed invention is that the viewer or listener does not notice any discrepancies in the relationship between the image and the sound being reproduced.³ Kaneko fails to recognize this advantage, and consequently, fails to address it.

Thus, Kaneko fails to teach, advise, or suggest one or more of the claimed limitations, so that claim 1 is patentable over Kaneko.

Kitamura Reference

The Examiner also rejects claims 2-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kitamura (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,421, issued March 9, 2004, assignee is ATI Technologies, Inc.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Kitamura discloses an automatic multichannel equalization control system for a multimedia computer.

Kitamura fails to teach, advise, or suggest "a filter coefficient selection section for receiving a correction command, from outside the signal processing apparatus, for specifying a correction method for the acoustic signal and selecting at least one of the plurality of filter coefficients stored in the memory

² Kaneko, column 2, lines 16-27.

³ Subject Application (as filed), page 3, lines 20-33.

based on the correction command" as recited in claim 1 (and claims 2-17, which variously depend from claim 1) (emphasis added).

The alleged "coefficient selection section for receiving a correction command" in Kitamura is an adaptive equalization template interface to facilitate input of user presets that are incorporated in stored equalization templates (e.g., for CD's, DVD's, digital audio tapes (DAT's)).⁴ But the template interface is not "for specifying a correction method for the acoustic signal and selecting at least one of the plurality of filter coefficients stored in the memory based on the correction command". Rather, the template interface in Kitamura is to facilitate the input of user presents (for CD's, DVD's, and tapes).

Kitamura also fails to teach, advise, or suggest "a correction section for correcting the acoustic signal using the at least one filter coefficient selected by the filter coefficient selection section so that the acoustic signal matches the image signal being reproduced together" as recited in claim 1 (and claims 2-17, which variously depend from claim 1) (emphasis added).

The alleged "correction section for correcting the acoustic signal" in Kitamura is a parametric filter block 70 for selectively equalizing each frequency band by a different control factor.⁵ Each parametric filter block 70 has a set of programmable audio filters to equalize each audio channel.⁶ But using a parametric filter block 70 for selectively equalizing each frequency band or audio channel does not amount to a correction section for correcting an acoustic signal so that the acoustic signal matches an image signal being reproduced together. Indeed, there is no image signal in Kitamura to have an acoustic signal to match the image signal (and furthermore being reproduced together).

Thus, Kitamura fails to teach, advise, or suggest one or more of the claimed limitations, so that claims 2-17 are patentable over Kitamura.

⁴ Kitamura, column 2, lines 36-60.

⁵ Kitamura, column 5, lines 64-66.

⁶ Kitamura, column 6, lines 7-11.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura as applied to claim 2 and further in view of Saito (U.S. Patent No. 3,766,547, Issued October 16, 1973, assignee is Sony Corporation). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Based on the above discussion of claim 1 and the Kitamura reference, claim 18 (which depends from claim 1) is also patentable over Kitamura in view of Saito.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is thus requested. Applicant invites the Office to telephone the undersigned if he or she has any questions whatsoever regarding this Response or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,



By:

Shahpar Shahpar
Reg. No. 45,875

Date: 10-7-05

SNELL & WILMER LLP.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
Phone: (602) 382-6306
Fax: (602) 382-6070
Email: sshahpar@swlaw.com

Page 11 of 11

1735517.1